

RS



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/726,024	10/04/1996	DANIEL A. HENDERSON		8599

2101 7590 05/18/2006
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
 125 SUMMER STREET
 BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER

ANWAH, OLISA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/726,024

Applicant(s)

HENDERSON, DANIEL A.

Examiner

Olisa Anwah

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-222 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-191 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 192-222 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 192-195, 198-200, 203, 208-210, 211 and 216-219 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,327,486 (hereinafter Wolff) in view of Richardson et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,459,458 (hereinafter Richardson).

Regarding 192, Wolff discloses a method of communicating information, from a calling party using a telephone connected to a telephone network that automatically provides caller identification information, to a called party having a portable communication device that can be contacted by a radio network in communication with a telephone answering apparatus, such telephone answering apparatus in communication with the telephone network, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2614

receiving at the telephone answering apparatus caller identification information, pertinent to the telephone of the calling party, provided automatically by the telephone network;

transmitting the caller identification information from the telephone answering device to the radio network; and

transmitting the caller identification information from the radio network to the portable communication device (see columns 3 and 4).

Wolff does not explicitly indicate the radio network is a paging network. Regardless, Richardson discloses this feature. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wolff with the general purpose data terminal of Richardson. This modification would have improved the flexibility of Wolff by reducing the size of the combined unit to fit in the end user's pocket or purse as suggested by Wolff (see column 6).

Regarding claim 193, Wolff discloses the telephone answering apparatus is connected to the radio network and the caller identification information is transmitted from the telephone answering apparatus to the radio network over a direct connection. Wolff does not explicitly indicate the radio network

Art Unit: 2614

is a paging network. Regardless, Richardson discloses this feature. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wolff with the general purpose data terminal of Richardson. This modification would have improved the flexibility of Wolff by reducing the size of the combined unit to fit in the end user's pocket or purse as suggested by Wolff (see column 6).

Regarding claim 194, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 195, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 198, see column 3 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 199, see column 7 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 200, see column 7 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 203, see column 7 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 208, Wolff teaches comparing the received caller identification information with information stored in an associated memory to the telephone answering apparatus and selectively transmitting the caller identification information to the radio network as a result of the comparison. Wolff does not explicitly indicate the radio network is a paging network. Regardless, Richardson discloses this feature. As a result, it

Art Unit: 2614

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wolff with the general purpose data terminal of Richardson. This modification would have improved the flexibility of Wolff by reducing the size of the combined unit to fit in the end user's pocket or purse as suggested by Wolff (see column 6).

Regarding claim 209, Wolf teaches the caller identification information is transmitted to the radio network only if the received caller identification matches an entry in the associated memory. Wolff does not explicitly indicate the radio network is a paging network. Regardless, Richardson discloses this feature. As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wolff with the general purpose data terminal of Richardson. This modification would have improved the flexibility of Wolff by reducing the size of the combined unit to fit in the end user's pocket or purse as suggested by Wolff (see column 6).

Regarding claim 210, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 211, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 216, see column 7 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 217, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 218, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

Regarding claim 219, see columns 3 and 4 of Wolff.

3. Claim 197 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff combined with Richardson in further view of Davis, U.S. Patent No. 4,942,598 (hereinafter Davis).

Regarding claim 197, the combination of Wolff and Richardson does not explicitly teach the caller identification information is provided from an ISDN connection. However Davis shows this feature (see column 2). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the connection of Davis. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by enabling high speed computer-to-computer interfacing as suggested by Davis (see column 2).

4. Claim 196 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff combined with Richardson in further view of Hotto, U.S. Patent No. 5,410,541 (hereinafter Hotto).

Regarding claim 196, the combination of Wolff and Richardson does not explicitly teach the caller identification information is provided as FSK data. However Hotto shows this

Art Unit: 2614

feature (see abstract). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the FSK data of Hotto. This modification would have improved the system's reliability by providing error free data communications during spurious intervals as suggested by Hotto (see column 2).

5. Claims 201 and 204 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff combined with Richardson in further view of Parvelescu et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,002,719 (hereinafter Parvelescu) (Note this reference is used because it is believed that this subject matter is not of record in the provisional application).

As per claim 201, the combination of Wolff and Richardson fails to teach compressing the optional data prior to transmission of the optional data to the portable terminal. Regardless, Parvelescu shows this feature (see column 1, line 7 to column 2, line 12). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with compressing the optional data prior to transmission of the optional data to the portable terminal as taught by Parvelescu.

Art Unit: 2614

This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by maximizing bandwidth utilization as suggested by Parvelescu.

Claim 204 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 201.

6. Claims 202 and 205 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff combined with Richardson in further view of Owen, U.S. Patent No. 5,483,595 (hereinafter Owen).

Regarding claim 202, the combination of Wolff and Richardson fails to teach encrypting the optional data prior to transmission of the optional data to the portable communication device. However Owen teaches the claimed encrypting limitation (see column 6, line 46 to column 7, line 7). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the encrypting mechanism of Owen. This modification would have improved the system's reliability by sending secure messages as suggested by Owen.

Claim 205 is rejected from the same reasons as claim 202.

7. Claims 206, 207, 221 and 222 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff combined with Richardson

Art Unit: 2614

in further view of De Luigi et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,418,529
(hereinafter De Luigi).

On the subject of claim 206, the combination of Wolff and Richardson is silent as to storing the caller identification and the optional data in contiguous memory locations in the portable communication device. However De Luigi shows this feature (see column 2, line 58 to line 19 of column 3). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson to include the memory management technique taught by De Luigi. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by reducing storage requirements as suggested by De Luigi.

On the subject of claim 207, the combination of Wolff and Richardson is silent as to storing the caller identification and the optional data in associated non-contiguous memory locations in the portable communication device. However De Luigi shows this feature (see column 2, line 58 to line 19 of column 3). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson to include the memory management technique taught by De Luigi. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by reducing storage requirements as suggested by De Luigi.

Claim 221 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 206.

Claim 222 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 207.

8. Claims 212-215 and 220 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff combined with Richardson in further view of Metroka et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,117,449 (hereinafter Metroka).

Regarding claim 212, the combination of Wolff and Richardson does not disclose storing the caller identification information within the portable communication device and initiating a new connection over the telephone network by transmitting the stored caller identification data to the telephone network. Nonetheless, Metroka discloses these features (see abstract). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the storing and initiating features of Metroka. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing a single, small, lightweight, portable device combining the advantages of both the cellular telephone and the pager as suggested by Metroka (see column 2).

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 213, the combination of Wolff and Richardson does not disclose storing the caller identification information within the portable communication device and initiating a new connection over a cellular telephone network by transmitting the stored caller identification data to the cellular telephone network. Nonetheless, Metroka discloses these features (see abstract). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the storing and initiating features of Metroka. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing a single, small, lightweight, portable device combining the advantages of both the cellular telephone and the pager as suggested by Metroka (see column 2).

Regarding claim 214, the combination of Wolff and Richardson does not teach the telephone network is a cellular communication network and the portable communication device comprises a combined cellular telephone device and pager device. However Metroka discloses these limitations (see abstract). And so, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the compact unitary

Art Unit: 2614

cellular/pager of Metroka. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing a single, small, lightweight, portable device combining the advantages of both the cellular telephone and the pager as suggested by Metroka (see column 2).

Regarding claim 215, the combination of Wolff and Richardson does not teach the paging network transmits the caller identification information to the portable communication device utilizing the cellular communication network. Nonetheless, Metroka shows this feature (see abstract). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with the compact unitary cellular/pager of Metroka. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing a single, small, lightweight, portable device combining the advantages of both the cellular telephone and the pager as suggested by Metroka (see column 2).

Regarding claim 220, the combination of Wolff and Richardson fails to teach applying the caller identification information to a voice synthesizer unit to generate voice

Art Unit: 2614

signals representative of the caller identification information at the portable communication device. Nonetheless, Metroka discloses this feature (see abstract). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Wolff and Richardson with a method of applying the caller identification information to a voice synthesizer unit to generate voice signals representative of the caller identification information at the portable communication device as taught by Metroka. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by providing various notification mechanisms as suggested by Wolff (see column 7).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

C.A.

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
May 12, 2006


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600